UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/678,822	10/02/2003	Karl Gartland	FIS920030068US1	1132

29371 7590 11/02/2007

CANTOR COLBURN LLP - IBM FISHKILL
55 GRIFFIN ROAD SOUTH
BLOOMFIELD, CT 06002

EXAMINER	
HIRL, JOSEPH P	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2129	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/02/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

Interview Summary	**Application No.** 10/678,822	**Applicant(s)** GARTLAND ET AL.
	Examiner Joseph P. Hirl	**Art Unit** 2129

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) *Joseph P. Hirl*.

(2) *Marisa J. Dubuc*.

(3)_____.

(4)_____.

Date of Interview: *31 October 2007*.

Type: a)☒ Telephonic b)☐ Video Conference
c)☐ Personal [copy given to: 1)☐ applicant 2)☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d)☐ Yes e)☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: *1*.

Identification of prior art discussed: *N/A*.

Agreement with respect to the claims f)☐ was reached. g)☐ was not reached. h)☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: *See attached fax. Discussion targeted centerpoint of the invention identified in lines 8-14 of the Abstract. Examiner commented that the proposed claim amendment to claim 1 moves in the right direction but the independent claims remain too generic and invite a plurality of prior art dealing with automated control of a manufacturing operation.*.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

10 AM

21 ?

CANTOR COLBURN LLP
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ATTORNEYS
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
telephone: (860) 286-2929
main fax: (860) 286-0115

FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL SHEET

DATE: October 30, 2007

TO: Joseph Hirl

COMPANY: USPTO

FAX NO.: 571-273-3685 TEL. NO.:

FROM: Sandy Yopp for Marisa J. Dubuc

TOTAL NUMBER OF PAGES SENT
(INCLUDING THIS COVER SHEET): 15

COMMENTS: RE: Serial No. 10/678,822 - Proposed Amendment

Should you have any problems with this transmission please call:
Sandy Yopp for Marisa J. Dubuc
at 860-286-2929

IMPORTANT: This message is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed, and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that reading, disseminating, distributing or copying this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify us by telephone, and return the original message to us at the above address via the U.S. Postal Service. Thank you.

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Karl Garland, et al.)
) Group Art Unit: 2129
Serial No.: 10/678,822)
) Examiner: Joseph P. Hirl
Filed: October 2, 2003)
) Confirmation No: 1132
For: METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR AUTOMATING ISSUE FEE RESOLUTION IN MANUFACTURING EXECUTION AND MATERIAL CONTROL SYSTEMS)

AMENDMENT

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

In response to the Office Action dated September 25, 2007, the Applicant submits the following amendment and remarks for entry in the above-entitled application.

Amendment to the Claims:

The following listing of claims replaces all previous versions and listings of claims:

1. (Original) In an automated manufacturing facility for running automatic production and having a plurality of pieces of automated equipment designed to carry out certain tasks and having interactive control systems, an automated issue resolution (ISR) system for automatically attempting to resolve identified issues that interfere with automatic production, the ISR system comprising:

an automated issue resolution management (ISRM) system for directing attempts to automatically resolve issues including error conditions relating to the automated manufacturing facility, the ISRM system including a plurality of automated components whose operations the ISRM system is operable to coordinate, the components including

a first component for automatically checking whether a first reported issue brought to its attention is a recognized issue for which an automatic resolution appears to be available; and

a second component for commanding the taking of automated corrective action by a portion of the automated manufacturing facility in response to a reported issue recognized by the first component;

wherein the second component is operatively arranged for advising via a first message that an automated corrective action cannot be taken because of a condition specifically identified in the first message; and

wherein the second component is operatively arranged for advising via a second message that an automated corrective action cannot be taken because of at least one piece of automated equipment identified in the second message is not in automatic mode.

2. (Original) An issue resolution system as in Claim 1, wherein the ISRM system further includes:

a third component for determining whether the automated corrective action appears to have resolved the recognized issue; and

a fourth component for logging whether the automated corrective action appears to have resolved the recognized issue.

3. (Original) An issue resolution system as in Claim 1, wherein the second component of ISRM system further includes:

a first subcomponent for determining whether an automated corrective action appears to be able to be taken at present; and

a second subcomponent, in communication with the first subcomponent, for advising that an automated corrective action cannot be executed at present.

4. (Original) ~~An issue resolution system as in Claim 3, wherein the second subcomponent of second component is operatively arranged for advising via a first message that an automated corrective action cannot be taken because of a condition specifically identified in the first message.~~

~~5. (Original) An issue resolution system as in Claim 4, wherein the second subcomponent of the second component is operatively arranged for advising via a second message that an automated corrective action cannot be taken because of at least one piece of automated equipment identified in the second message is not in automatic mode~~.

6. (Original) An issue resolution system as in Claim 1, wherein the ISRM system further includes at least a plurality of second components which are each respectively dedicated to attempting to resolve of a different recognized issue.

7. (Original) An issue resolution system as in Claim 1, wherein the second component of the ISRM system further includes a first subcomponent for providing at least first and second courses of possible automated corrective action, and a second subcomponent for commanding the taking of the first course of possible automated corrective action, and then the taking of the second course of possible automated corrective action if needed.

8. (Original) An issue resolution system as in Claim 1, further comprising:

a third component for determining whether the automated corrective action that was commanded appears to have resolved the recognized issue; and wherein

the third component includes a first subcomponent for providing a first message indicating whether the commanded automated corrective action appears to have resolved the issue, and

the second component includes

a first subcomponent for providing at least first and second possible automated corrective actions, and

a second subcomponent for commanding the taking of the first possible automated corrective action, and then commanding the taking of the second possible automated corrective action if needed, and

a third subcomponent for receiving the first message provided by third component and deciding whether the second subcomponent needs to command the taking of the second possible automated corrective action.

9. (Original) Same amendments here. An issue resolution system as in Claim 8, wherein the ISRM system further includes:

at least a plurality of second components as set forth above, but with each being dedicated to attempting to resolve a distinct recognized issue; and

a command memory for providing information pertinent to possible corrective actions with respect to at least a plurality of distinct recognized issues; and

a command sequencer for helping generate at least first and second commands to initiate automated corrective actions in sequence as needed.

10. (Original) An issue resolution system as in Claim 8, wherein the ISRM system

further comprising:

a fourth component for logging for future reference whether an automated corrective action that was commanded appears to have resolved the recognized issue;

a fifth component for providing a message indicating which automated corrective action that was commanded appears to have resolved the recognized issue; and

a sixth component, operatively arranged to receive a message from the fifth component, for logging for future reference at least part of the information contained in such received message.

11. (Original) In an automated manufacturing facility having interactive control systems which interface with pieces of automated equipment that carry out certain assigned tasks, an automated issue resolution (ISR) system for automatically attempting to resolve identified issues that interfere with automatic production, the ISR system comprising:

a first component for automatically checking whether a first issue reported to its attention is a recognized issue for which an automatic resolution appears to be available; and

a second component for automatically commanding the taking of automated corrective action by a portion of the automated manufacturing facility in response to a reported issue recognized by the first component.

12. (Original) An issue resolution system as in Claim 11, further comprising:

a third component for determining whether the automated corrective action that was commanded appears to have resolved the reported issue that was recognized; and

a fourth component for logging whether the automated corrective action that was commanded appears to have resolved the reported issue that was recognized.

13. (Original) An issue resolution system as in Claim 11, wherein the second component further includes:

a first subcomponent for determining whether an automated corrective action is able to be taken at present; and

a second subcomponent, in communication with the first subcomponent, for advising that an automated corrective action cannot be executed at present.

14. (Original) An issue resolution system as in Claim 13, wherein the second subcomponent of second component is operatively arranged for advising via a first message that an automated corrective action that is being commanded cannot be taken because of a condition specifically identified in the first message.

15. (Original) An issue resolution system as in Claim 14, wherein the second subcomponent of the second component is operatively arranged for advising via a second message that the automated corrective action being commanded cannot be taken because at least one piece of automated equipment is not in full automatic mode.

16. (Original) An issue resolution system as in Claim 1, wherein the ISR system further includes at least a plurality of like second components, but with each of such second components being dedicated to the resolution of a distinct recognized issue.

17. (Original) An issue resolution system as in Claim 11, wherein the second component of the ISR system further includes a first subcomponent for providing at least first and second courses of possible automated corrective action, and a second subcomponent for commanding the taking of the first course of possible automated corrective action, and then the taking of the second possible corrective action if needed.

18. (Original) An issue resolution system as in Claim 11, further comprising:

a third component for determining whether the automated corrective action that was commanded appears to have resolved the recognized issue; and wherein

the third component includes a first subcomponent for providing a first message indicating that the reported issue that was recognized no longer appears to be an issue, and the second component includes

a first subcomponent for providing at least first and second possible courses of automated corrective action, and

a second subcomponent for automatically commanding the taking of the first course of possible corrective action, and then automatically commanding the taking of the second course of corrective action if needed, and

a third subcomponent for receiving the first message from the third component and deciding whether the second subcomponent needs to command the taking of the second course of automated corrective action.

19. (Original) An issue resolution system as in Claim 18, which further comprises:

at least a plurality of second components respectively dedicated to attempting to resolve a distinct recognized issue, with at least two of such second components each including –

a first subcomponent for providing a least first and second courses of possible corrective action for its distinct recognized issue, and

a second subcomponent for commanding the taking of the first course of possible corrective action, and then commanding the taking of the second course of corrective action if needed with respect to its distinct recognized issue, and

a command memory for providing information pertinent to a plurality of courses of possible corrective actions with respect to distinct recognized issues, and

a command sequencer for helping generate at least first and second commands to initiate automated corrective actions in sequence as needed.

20. (Original) An issue resolution system as in Claim 18, further comprising:

a fourth component for logging for future reference whether the automated corrective action that was commanded appears to have resolved the recognized issue;

a fifth component for providing a message indicating which automated corrective action that was commanded appears to have resolved the recognized issue; and

a sixth component, operatively arranged to receive messages from the fifth component, for logging for future reference at least part of the information contained in such messages.

21. (Original) Same amendments here. An automated method of managing automatic recoveries from error conditions in an automated factory environment that has automated computerized control systems which control and supervise the operations of automated equipment therein, the method comprising the steps of:

(a) installing a supervisory program for managing attempts to recover automatically from selected error conditions reported by at least one of the control systems in the automated factory;

(b) determining whether incoming error conditions received by the supervisory program are recognized as issues for which an automatic resolution appears to be available;

(c) for the first incoming error condition that is so recognized in step (b), under the auspices of the supervisory program, accessing information associated with the incoming recognized error condition to enable the generation of a first set of automated corrective commands; and

(d) under the auspices of the supervisory program, generating at least a first command for automated corrective action to be taken by a portion of the automated factory in an effort to resolve automatically the first recognized incoming error condition.

22. (Original) The automated method of recovering from error conditions as set forth in claim 21, further comprising the steps of:

(e) determining whether the automated corrective action taken appears to have resolved the recognized incoming error condition; and

(f) logging whether the automated corrective action which was taken appears to have resolved the recognized incoming error condition.

23. (Original) The automated method of recovering from error conditions as set forth in claim 22, further comprising the steps of:

(g) determining whether an automated corrective action is able to be taken at present; and

(h) advising that an automated corrective action cannot be executed at present.

24. (Original) The automated method of recovering from error conditions as set forth in claim 23, wherein step (h) includes:

advising at certain times via a first message that an automated corrective action cannot be taken because of a condition at least partially identified in the first message, and

advising at certain other times via a second message that an automated corrective action cannot be taken because of at least one piece of automation equipment is not in a required automatic mode.

25. (Original) The automated method of recovering from error conditions as set forth in claim 21, wherein the supervisory program has associated therewith a plurality of distinct recognized error conditions for which different sets of corrective commands associated with various automated corrective actions may be used in attempts to recover therefrom, and method further comprises, as part of step (d), the substeps of:

(1) selecting at least a first course of possible automated corrective action, and generating, based at least in part thereon, a first set of commands to initiate the first course of automated corrective action, and

(2) in the event that the recognized incoming error condition does not appear to have been corrected in response to the first set of commands, selecting a second course of possible automated corrective action, and thereafter generating, based at least in part thereon, a second set of commands to initiate the second course of automated corrective action.

26. (Original) The automated method of recovering from error conditions as set forth in claim 25, further comprising the steps of:

(e) for a second incoming error condition that is so recognized in step (b), under the auspices of the supervisory program, accessing information associated with that recognized incoming error condition to enable the generation of at least a first set of automated corrective commands via the supervisory program distinct from the first set of automated corrective commands generated in response to the first incoming error condition recognized in step (b); and

(f) under the auspices of the supervisory program, generating at least a first set of commands for initiating automated corrective action to be taken by a portion of the automated factory in an effort to resolve automatically the second recognized incoming error condition.

27. (Original) The automated method of recovering from error conditions as set forth in claim 26, that further comprises the following further steps:

(g) in the event that first incoming error condition does not appear to have been corrected in response to the first set of commands generated automatically to recover from that first incoming error condition, sequentially thereafter automatically commanding the generation of a second set of commands associated with a second course of possible automated corrective action for that first incoming error condition, and

(h) in the event that second incoming error condition does not appear to have been corrected in response to the first set of commands generated automatically to recover from that second incoming error condition, sequentially thereafter automatically commanding the generation of a second set of commands associated with a second course of possible automated corrective action for that second incoming error condition.

28. (Original) The automated method of recovering from error conditions as set forth in claim 21, wherein the supervisory program includes:

at least a plurality of sets of logic each dedicated to the resolution of a distinct recognized incoming error condition, with each such sets of logic providing a at least first and second courses of possible corrective action with respect to its distinct recognized error condition, and

the method further includes the steps of:

(e) for each distinct incoming recognized error condition, sequentially commanding the taking of the first course of possible corrective action for that error condition, and then commanding the taking of a second course of corrective action if the first course appears to have not resolved the error condition.

29. (Original) The automated method of recovering from error conditions as set forth in claim 28, wherein the supervisory program includes:

a command memory for providing information pertinent to a plurality of courses of possible corrective actions with respect to distinct recognized incoming error conditions, and

the method further includes the steps of:

(f) for at least a plurality of recognized incoming error conditions, logging whether the incoming error conditions appear to have been automatically corrected; and

(g) for at least a plurality of recognized incoming error conditions, logging which corrective commands out of a plurality of possible corrective commands appear to have been responsible for automatically effecting correction of the error conditions.

30. (Original) A computer program product, to be used in an automated factory environment that has automated computerized control systems which control and supervise the operations of the factory and pieces of automated equipment therein, for implementing an automated method for managing automatic recoveries from error conditions, the software product comprising:

a storage medium readable by at least one processing circuit and storing instructions for execution by the processing circuit for performing the method comprising the steps of –

(a) installing a supervisory program for managing attempts to recover automatically from selected error conditions reported by at least one of the control systems in the automated factory;

(b) determining whether incoming error conditions received by the supervisory program are recognized as issues for which an automatic resolution appears to be available;

(c) for the first incoming error condition that is so recognized in step (b), under the auspices of the supervisory program, accessing information associated with the incoming recognized error condition to enable the generation of a first set of automated corrective commands; and

(d) under the auspices of the supervisory program, generating at least a first command for automated corrective action to be taken by a portion of the automated factory in an effort to resolve automatically the first recognized incoming error condition.

REMARKS

Claims 1-30 are pending in the instant application. Claims 1-30 have been rejected by the Examiner. Claims 1-__________ have been amended. The Applicant submits that claims 1-_____________ are in condition for allowance and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections. No new matter has been entered.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that the foregoing amendments and remarks fully comply with the Office Action and that the claims herein should now be allowable to Applicants. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance is requested. It is submitted that the foregoing amendments and remarks should render the case in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, as the cited references neither anticipate nor render obvious that which the applicant deems to be the invention, it is respectfully requested that claims 1-________ be passed to issue.

If there are any additional charges with respect to this Amendment or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 09-0458.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP
Applicant's Attorneys

By________________________________
Marisa J. Dubuc
Registration No. 46,673
Customer No. 29371

Date: October ___, 2007

Address: 55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone: (860) 286-2929
Fax: (860) 286-0115